

REMARKS

In the most recent Office Action (mailed February 2, 2009), the Examiner indicated that claims 217, 219, 221 and 225 are allowed while claims 218, 238, 277 and 283-285 are rejected. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's helpful comments in her rejections. The amendments made herein are deemed to place the application in condition for allowance of all of the claims without changing the scope of the claims. Reconsideration in view of the instant amendments and comments below is respectfully requested.

First, to address the Examiner's concern at p. 2 in regard to the wording of claims 218, 277, 283 and 284, Applicants point out the meaning of the term "linker sequence" as used in the claims. As recited in claim 217, a method for inhibiting growth of a cancer cell relates to the provision of a polypeptide comprising the binding domain of a  $\beta$  integrin subunit for ERK2 MAP kinase wherein the binding domain **includes** an amino acid linker sequence that **links opposite end regions** of the binding domain **together** and wherein the linker sequence is non-essential for binding of the MAP kinase to the binding domain. That is, the "linker sequence" is **a middle region** of the binding domain **itself** but is not necessary for actual binding of the polypeptide to the MAP kinase.

In response to the Examiner's comments about the linker sequence in rejecting claims 277, 283 and 284, Applicants have created a parallel set of claims by rewriting claim 284 in independent form as new claim 286, which is not dependent on claim 217. In particular, new claim 286 specifies that the polypeptide used in the claimed method comprises an amino acid sequence of a binding domain of the  $\beta$  integrin subunit for ERK2 MAP kinase from

which the **"linker sequence" is deleted**. This differs from the polypeptide utilized in the method of claim 217, wherein the utilized polypeptide **includes** the amino acid linker sequence. Furthermore, claim 277 (and, thus, claim 283) and claim 285 have been amended to depend now on new claim 286, instead of on claim 217. Applicants submit, therefore, that the rejections of claims 277, 283, and 284 have been overcome.

Concerning claim 285, the Examiner stated at the top of p. 3 that SEQ ID NO: 3 is not properly part of the scope of claim 284. The Applicants submit that SEQ ID NO: 3, which represents the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 from which the middle five amino acids, the linker sequence, have been removed, **is** properly part of the scope of independent claim 286, the successor claim to claim 284.

Claim 238 has been amended to delete reference to "other areas of the mouth" and "other oral cavities."

Finally, claims 218, 277 and 283, which are written in closed form, have been amended to include a facilitator moiety coupled to the recited amino acid sequence, in order to address the Examiner's concern recited in the final paragraph of p. 3.

Therefore, Applicants submit that all of the Examiner's rejections and concerns have been addressed and that all claims are in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/019,816  
Filed: March 27, 2002  
TC Art Unit: 1643  
Confirmation No.: 9944

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Valentine Agrez et al.

Date: June 3, 2009

By: /Holliday C. Heine/  
Holliday C. Heine, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 34,346  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

HCH/nja

381221.1